Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission:	4/10/2009
2. Agency:	Department of Energy
3. Bureau:	Environmental And Other Defense Activities
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	EM HQ Integrated Planning, Accountability, and Budgeting System Information System (IPABS-IS)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	019-10-01-15-01-1014-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	Operations and Maintenance
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2001 or earlier

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

EM is a $200 billion program responsible for the cleanup of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex. Over 200 active projects, all tracked in a web-enabled, eGov management system, IPABS-IS. The application collects performance-based data to manage these projects to meet strategy and legally binding milestones. IPABS-IS supports all of EM's performance metrics and milestone reporting, budget formulation, project execution, budget automation and administration, budget execution, and configuration management.

Before IPABS-IS, EM did not have the necessary project-level data to manage to detailed milestones. IPABS-IS fulfills EM's data collection and reporting gap. It is used for information collaboration and exchange with other agency departmental systems to greatly reduce data redundancy. Collaboration with OECM's PARS, the CID, and DOE's financial system STARS and performance metric reporting system JOULE. Planned collaboration with EPA to provide CERCLA milestone compliance data is currently under consideration. Pre-IPABS-IS, EM often made redundant and overlapping data calls for required information. Manual Data calls required significant federal and contractor staff resources. IPABS-IS' implementation has significantly improved data redundancy and information, while decreasing resources required to obtain, review, and collate data.

IPABS-IS improves project performance through accountability and improved reporting. The system reduced data entry time via information sharing between Budget Formulation and the BAJA Module of IPABS, allowing the EM Budget Office staff more time to complete a thorough data analysis. IPABS-IS provides the interfaces for these external facing documents: the Congressional Report and Five Year Plan and DOE's Environmental Liability Report and Congressional Budget Submission. The system also supports the automation and consistency of EM Senior Management Quarterly Project Review (QPRs) packages. Users enter data into the system to generate consistent QPR packages for all sites. IPABS-IS supports DOE strategic theme 5: Management Excellence: Enabling the mission through sound management.

IPABS-IS is aligned with all layers of DOE's Enterprise Architecture, and is included in the agency's target architecture and DOE's EITA. Primary BRM mapping is Environmental Management. Data class attributes are in alignment with DEAR. Functional enhancement and architecture design are governed by the IPABS Steering committee.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	8/21/2008
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes
11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?	
Name	Zenkowich, Mathew
Phone Number	202-586-4612
Email	Mathew.Zenkowich@em.doe.gov
a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager?	Waiver Issued

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned?	9/1/2005
c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification?	4/1/2006
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project?	Yes
a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes
b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	No
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?	Yes
If "yes," check all that apply:	Expanded E-Government Budget Performance Integration
a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)	Expanded eGov: IPABS-IS has reduced EM's oversight costs and afforded more resources for mission goals. Through interfaces with other agency systems IPABS-IS ensures the reduction of duplicative data entry and data discrepancies between systems. Budget Performance Integration: The Budget Formulation Module collects lifecycle project and budget execution data, used to auto-generate the EM Budget via BAJA. BAJA ensures consistency throughout the EM Budget.
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)	Yes
a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?	No
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?	10001176 - Environmental Management
c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?	Adequate
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	Level 1
17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)	No
19. Is this a financial management system?	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	No
1. If "yes," which compliance area:	
2. If "no," what does it address?	IPABS-IS is the project-based system that supports the routine data collection, configuration managementt, budget generation, and reporting needs of the DOE EM Program.

b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	0
Software	0
Services	100
Other	0
21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?	N/A

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name	Kolb, Ingrid
Phone Number	202-586-2550
Title	DOE-EM Security Officer
E-mail	Ingrid.kolb@hq.doe.gov
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	Yes

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?	No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS)
(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acquisition:	1.96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.96
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	1.96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.96
Operations & Maintenance:	16.82	2.85	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	14	50.17
TOTAL:	18.78	2.85	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	14	52.13
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	2.125	0.325	0.325	0.325	0.35	0.35	0.35	1.4	5.550
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	17

Note: For the multi-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?	No

a. If "yes," How many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

There are several changes to the summary of Spending Table that were necessary to more accurately reflect the life-cycle costs of this investment. The most recent operational analysis showed that IPABS-IS continues to meet EM's core business processes, and the system's routine maintenance schedule allows for updates that are deemed necessary to align the system with EM's dynamic business needs. Therefore, planning for IPABS-IS operations and maintenance support has been extended through BY2017. In addition, costs for Government FTE's were erroneously reported in total costs for Planning, Operations and Maintenance in previous year's submission. This has been corrected and aligned

correctly throughout investment life-cycle.

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Contracts/Task Orders Table: * Costs in millions

Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition? (Y/N)
DE-AM01-06IM00054	Energy Enterprise Solution (A-76 Awarded Contract)	Yes	11/29/2006	12/1/2006	12/31/2012	5.5	No	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thornton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
DE-AI04-2000AL66856	Raytheon/Time and Materials	Yes	4/1/2007	5/1/2007	12/31/2012	15.2	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Thornton, Patrick	202-287-1532 / Patrick.Thorton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	
TBD	TBD Time and Materials	No	11/1/2012	11/1/2012	9/30/2017	17.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	Yes	Thorton, Patrick	202-287-1532/Patrick.Thorton@pr.doe.gov	Level 3	

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

N/A

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
a. Explain why not or how this is being done?	Current data collection and reporting functionality is all section 508 compliant. All new development will be tested using accepted methods for testing 508 compliance. New code will not be rolled out until it passes these tests; several EM IT staff are trained in section 508 compliance and will be consulted whenever necessary to ensure conformity with the requirements.
4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date?	5/1/2007
1. Is it Current?	Yes
b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	
1. If "no," briefly explain why:	

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures (indicators) must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2007	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	Percentage (%) of reports that are automatically updated when data is approved in the IPABS-IS Data Collection Tool to ensure EM has the most up-to-date data on the performance of EM cleanup sites.	86% of reports are automatically updated in the Report Module	Increase number of reports automatically updated in the Report Module by an additional 4% for a total of 90%	90% of reports are automatically updated in the Report Module of IPABS-IS to date.
2007	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	IPABS-IS will be the sole source for all decisional data from the Field related to budget and performance (100%). We are working toward this goal by gradually curtailing other data sources and including them in the IPABS-IS.	By the end of FY 2006, IPABS-IS will be used for about 95% of the data included in the EM budget request to Congress. The remaining 5% of data is provided from offline sources, mostly as edits or additions to existing data.	Over 96% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS.	97% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS to date.
2007	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Cycle Time	Provide life-cycle cost data to the IG Auditors by July 15th of	Data submitted on July 14, 2006.	Data submitted by July 15, 2007.	Submitted July 10, 2007

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy				every year, in order to support timely, efficient data submission for the DOE-EM Environmental Liability Estimate.			
2007	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Ensure IPABS-IS customer needs are met through rapid response to help desk calls	98% of customer requests responded to in 24 hours	Respond to over 99% of customer requests in 24 hours	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2007
2007	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage (%) of system uptime	99.5 % system uptime	Maintain over 99% system uptime	99.5% system uptime to date
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Provide life-cycle cost data to the IG Auditors by July 15th of every year, in order to support timely, efficient data submission for the DOE-EM Environmental Liability Estimate.	Data submitted on July 10, 2007.	Data submitted on July 15, 2008.	Data submitted on time.
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Produce the EM Congressional Budget in January 2008.	Congressional Budget produced in January 2007.	Produce the EM Congressional Budget in January 2008	EM Congressional Budget produced in January 2008.
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	IPABS-IS will be the sole source for all decisional data from the Field related to budget and performance (100%). We are working toward this goal by gradually curtailing other data sources and including them in the IPABS-IS.	97% of EM HQ budget formulation-related data collected through IPABS-IS.	Over 97% of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data will be collected through IPABS-IS.	Accomplished goal
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	Percentage (%) of reports that are automatically updated when data is approved in the IPABS-IS Data Collection Tool to ensure EM has the most up-to-date data on the performance of EM cleanup	90% of reports are automatically updated in the Report Module of IPABS-IS to date.	Increase number of reports automatically updated in the Report Module for a total of 92%.	Accomplished goal

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
					sites.			
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Ensure IPABS-IS customer needs are being met through rapid response to help desk calls.	98% of customer requests responded to in 24 hours.	Respond to over 99% of customer requests in 24 hours.	100% of calls responded to within 24 hours
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Percentage (%) of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data that will be collected through IPABS-IS.	97% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS to date.	By the end of FY 2008, IPABS-IS will be used for about 98% of the data included in the EM budget request to Congress. The remaining 2% of data are provided from offline sources, mostly as edits or additions to existing data	98% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS to date.
2008	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage (%) of system uptime	99.5% system uptime	Maintain over 99% system uptime.	Actual uptime was over 99%
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Provide life-cycle cost data to the IG Auditors by July 15th of every year, in order to support timely, efficient data submission for the DOE-EM Environmental Liability Estimate.	Actual results will be available Q4 2008.	Data submitted on July 15, 2009.	Actual results will be available Q4 2009.
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Produce the EM Congressional Budget by January 2009.	EM Congressional Budget produced in January 2008.	Produce the EM Congressional Budget by January 2009.	Budget produced in January 2009.
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	IPABS-IS will be the sole source for all decisional data from the Field related to budget and performance (100%). We are working toward this goal by gradually curtailing other data sources and including them in IPABS-IS.	Actual results will be available Q2 FY 2008.	Over 98% of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data will be collected through IPABS-IS.	98% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS to date.
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	Percentage (%) of reports that are automatically updated when	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2008.	Increase number of reports automatically updated in the Report Module	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2009.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy				data is approved in the IPABS-IS Data Collection Tool to ensure EM has the most up-to-date data on the performance of EM cleanup sites.		for a total of 95%.	
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Ensure IPABS-IS customer needs are being met through rapid response to help desk calls.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2008.	Respond to over 99% of customer requests in 24 hours.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2009.
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Percentage (%) of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data that will be collected through IPABS-IS.	98% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS to date.	By the end of FY 2009, IPABS-IS will be used for about 98% of the data included in the EM budget request to Congress. The remaining 2% of data are provided from offline sources, mostly as edits or additions to existing data.	98 % of data derived from IPABS
2009	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage (%) of system uptime.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2008.	Maintain over 99% system uptime.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2009.
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Provide life-cycle cost data to the IG Auditors by July 15th of every year, in order to support timely, efficient data submission for the DOE-EM Environmental Liability Estimate.	Actual results will be available Q4 2009.	Data submitted on July 15, 2010.	Actual results will be available Q4 2010.
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Produce the EM Congressional Budget by January 2009.	EM Congressional Budget produced in January 2008	Produce the EM Congressional Budget by January 2010.	Actual results will be available January 2010.
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	IPABS-IS will be the sole source for all decisional data from the Field related to budget and performance (100%). We are working toward this goal by gradually	Actual results will be available Q2 FY 2009.	Over 98% of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data will be collected through IPABS-IS.	Actual results will be available end of Q2 FY 2010.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Energy				curtailing other data sources and including them in IPABS-IS.			
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	Percentage (%) of reports that are automatically updated when data is approved in the IPABS-IS Data Collection Tool to ensure EM has the most up-to-date data on the performance of EM cleanup sites.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2009.	Increase number of reports automatically updated in the Report Module for a total of 97%.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2010.
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Ensure IPABS-IS customer needs are being met through rapid response to help desk calls.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2009.	Respond to over 99% of customer requests in 24 hours.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2010.
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Percentage (%) of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data that will be collected through IPABS-IS.	98% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS to date.	IPABS-IS will be used for about 98% of the data included in the EM budget request to Congress. The remaining 2% of data are provided from offline sources, mostly as edits or additions to existing data.	Actual results will be available Q2 FY 2010.
2010	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage (%) of system uptime.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2009.	Maintain over 99% system uptime.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2010.
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Provide life-cycle cost data to the IG Auditors by July 15th of every year, in order to support timely, efficient data submission for the DOE-EM Environmental Liability Estimate.	Actual results will be available Q4 2009.	Data submitted on July 15, 2011.	Actual results will be available Q4 2011.
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Produce the EM Congressional Budget by January 20011.	EM Congressional Budget produced in January 2008.	Produce the EM Congressional Budget by January 2011.	Actual results will be available January 2011.
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	Information Management	Produce the EM Congressional Budget by January 2012	EM Congressional Budget produced in January 2008	Produce the EM Congressional Budget by January 2012.	Actual results will be available January 2012.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy							
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	IPABS-IS will be the sole source for all decisional data from the Field related to budget and performance (100%). We are working toward this goal by gradually curtailing other data sources and including them in IPABS-IS.	97% of EM HQ budget formulation-related data collected through IPABS-IS.	99% of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data will be collected through IPABS-IS.	Actual results will be available end of Q2 FY 2011.
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	Percentage (%) of reports that are automatically updated when data is approved in the IPABS-IS Data Collection Tool to ensure EM has the most up-to-date data on the performance of EM cleanup sites.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2010.	Increase number of reports automatically updated in the Report Module for a total of 98%.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2011.
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Timeliness	Ensure IPABS-IS customer needs are being met through rapid response to help desk calls.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2010.	Respond to over 99% of customer requests in 24 hours.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2011.
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Availability	Percentage (%) of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data that will be collected through IPABS-IS.	98% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS to date.	IPABS-IS will be used for over 98% of the data included in the EM budget request to Congress. The remaining 2% of data are provided from offline sources, mostly as edits or additions to existing data.	Actual results will be available Q2 FY 2011.
2011	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage (%) of system uptime.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2010.	Maintain over 99% system uptime.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2011.
2012	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites	Customer Results	Service Accessibility	Service Availability	Percentage (%) of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data that will be collected through IPABS-IS.	98.5% of data in the EM budget request to Congress derived directly from IPABS-IS to date.	By the end of FY IPABS-IS will be used for over 98.5% of the data included in the EM budget request to Congress. The remaining 2% of	Actual results will be available Q2 FY 2012.

Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	across the U.S. Department of Energy						data are provided from offline sources, mostly as edits or additions to existing data.	
2012	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	Percentage (%) of reports that are automatically updated when data is approved in the IPABS-IS Data Collection Tool to ensure EM has the most up-to-date data on the performance of EM cleanup sites.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2011.	Increase number of reports automatically updated in the Report Module for a total of 99%.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2012
2012	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Mission and Business Results	Information and Technology Management	IT Infrastructure Maintenance	IPABS-IS will be the sole source for all decisional data from the Field related to budget and performance (100%). We are working toward this goal by gradually curtailing other data sources and including them in the IPABS-IS.	Actual results will be available Q2 FY 2011.	99% of all EM HQ budget formulation-related data will be collected through IPABS-IS.	Actual results will be available Q4 2012.
2012	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Cycle Time	Provide life-cycle cost data to the IG Auditors by July 15th of every year, in order to support timely, efficient data submission for the DOE-EM Environmental Liability Estimate.	Actual results will be available Q4 2009.	Data submitted on July 15, 2012.	Actual results will be available Q4 2012.
2012	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints	Ensure IPABS-IS customer needs are met through rapid response to help desk calls	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2011.	Respond to over 99% of customer requests in 24 hours.	Actual results will be available end of Q4 2012
2012	GOAL 4.1 Environmental Cleanup Complete cleanup of the contaminated nuclear weapons manufacturing and testing sites across the U.S. Department of Energy	Technology	Reliability and Availability	Reliability	Percentage (%) of system uptime	99.5 % system uptime	Maintain over 99% system uptime	

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the

investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?:

a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment?

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	Planned Operational Date	Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested
IPAB-IS							

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?

a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?

a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

IPABS-IS is operated at an off-site hosting facility at DOE's Savannah River Site, which maintains security standards that meet or exceed those required by Federal law and policy, as specified by the contract. As part of our FISMA Reporting program, the contractor security procedures are monitored by annual risk assessments (based on risk management plans), periodic scanning, and ISARM report monitoring. The system C&A was completed in FY 2007 and will be renewed as scheduled in FY 2010. Additionally, IPABS-IS security procedures have undergone third-party independent audits, which verify system security compliance.

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
IPAB-IS	No	Yes	A PIA has been conducted on this system, but	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
			IPABS-IS does not collect data on the public. A PIA has been prepared and submitted to EM OCIO for signature. A copy of PIA is posted internally (after authentication) at https://ipabs-is.doe.gov/ipabs/security/message.htm.		system of records.

Details for Text Options:
Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	Yes
a. If "no," please explain why?	
2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.	EM HQ Integrated Planning Accountability and Budgeting System Information System
b. If "no," please explain why?	
3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture?	No
a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.	245-000

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
Balanced Scorecard	Support the listing of analyzing of both positive and negative impacts associated with a decision	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Balanced Scorecard			No Reuse	14
Decision Support and Planning	Support the analysis of information and predict the impact of decisions before they are made	Business Analytical Services	Business Intelligence	Decision Support and Planning			No Reuse	17
Ad-Hoc	Support the analysis of	Business Analytical	Reporting	Ad Hoc			No Reuse	15

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	FEA SRM Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component (a)	Service Component Reused Name (b)	Service Component Reused UPI (b)	Internal or External Reuse? (c)	BY Funding Percentage (d)
	dynamic reports on an as needed basis	Services						
Standardized/Canned	Support the use of pre-conceived or pre-written reports	Business Analytical Services	Reporting	Standardized / Canned			No Reuse	17
Governance/Policy Management	Influence and determine decisions, actions, business rules and other matters within an organization	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Governance / Policy Management			No Reuse	17
Program/Project Management	Manage and control a particular effort of an organization	Business Management Services	Management of Processes	Program / Project Management			No Reuse	20

a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:
To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
	Component Framework	Security		
	Component Framework	Security		
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Hosting	
Standardized / Canned	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
Program / Project Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
Program / Project Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
Balanced Scorecard	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	
Balanced Scorecard	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Balanced Scorecard	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	
Governance / Policy	Service Platform and	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:
To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Management	Infrastructure			
Governance / Policy Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Governance / Policy Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Governance / Policy Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Governance / Policy Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
Ad Hoc	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Peripherals	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Wide Area Network (WAN)	
Standardized / Canned	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Program / Project Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Decision Support and Planning	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
Program / Project Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	

a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, etc)? No

a. If "yes," please describe.

Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)

Section A: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

Part III should be completed only for investments identified as "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?	1/30/2009
b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?

a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?

b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

1. Was an operational analysis conducted?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed.	5/30/2008

b. If "yes," what were the results?

The IPABS-IS management team performs an e-government strategy operational analysis review that is compliant with departmental best practices. For purposes of analysis and application of management control thresholds, the investment lifecycle window is FY 2008-2012. Lifecycle costs are $15.85M. The analysis involved end-user feedback, quantitative performance metrics, and a comprehensive examination of how well IPABS-IS aligns with EM's core business processes. To gain user feedback, system users received the annual electronic user survey before the EM Budget and Planning Workshop held September 2007. During the conference, significant time was alloted to discuss feedback and obtain additional suggestions for improving IPABS-IS and business processes. This conference also provided users with tips and techniques for improving data quality, an overview of key IPABS-IS functionalities including a review of QPR data within the Project Execution Module, and information regarding biannual budget updates.

The operational analysis revealed that IPABS-IS continues to meet EM's core business processes, and the system's routine maintenance schedule allows for updates that are deemed necessary to align the system with EM's dynamic business needs. The most recent analysis resulted in milestones number two, four and ten (listed below in Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table) being postponed indefinitely, therefore there is no variance. The IPABS Steering Committee (comprised of field site and Headquarter system users) also ensures the system continues to meet EM's dynamic business needs through bi-weekly conference calls to discuss routine maintenance and necessary system updates. Necessary changes to the system undergo thorough internal and external user testing to ensure updates enhance EM's business needs.

c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:

2. Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts).

a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Contractor and Government

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost($M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost($M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost($M)
1	Software and Hardware Acquisition	9/30/2002	$1.960000	9/30/2002	$1.960000	0	$0.000000
2	Operations and Maintenance	9/30/2002	$2.720000	9/30/2002	$2.720000	0	$0.000000
3	Operations and Maintenance	9/30/2003	$2.800000	9/30/2003	$2.800000	0	$0.000000
4	Operations and Maintenance	9/30/2004	$2.800000	9/30/2004	$2.800000	0	$0.000000
5	FDS interface (DOE management postponed indefinitely)	9/30/2005	$0.100000				
6	IPABS-IS modifications to support EM business processes	9/30/2005	$0.950000	9/30/2005	$0.950000	0	$0.000000
7	Develop electronic interface to Departmental performance tracking system	9/30/2005	$0.500000	9/30/2005	$0.500000	0	$0.000000
8	Develop electronic interface to I-MANAGE/STARS (DOE management postponed indefinitely)	3/31/2005	$0.150000				
9	Project Operations (All)	9/30/2005	$1.150000	9/30/2005	$1.135000	0	$0.015000
10	IPABS-IS Training	9/30/2006	$0.125000	9/30/2006	$0.035000	0	$0.090000
11	Oracle Licensing	9/30/2006	$0.100000	12/28/2006	$0.042000	-89	$0.058000
12	IPABS-IS modifications to support routine business process changes	9/30/2006	$1.050000	9/30/2006	$0.940000	0	$0.110000
13	Project Operations (All)	9/30/2006	$1.035000	9/30/2006	$1.350000	0	-$0.315000
14	Develop electronic interface to I-MANAGE budget formulation system (DOE management postponed indefinitely)	9/30/2006	$0.490000				
15	Steady State Operations and Management	9/30/2007	$2.850000	9/30/2007	$2.950000	0	-$0.100000
16	Steady State Operations and Management	9/30/2008	$2.800000	9/30/2008	$2.600000	0	$0.200000
17	Steady State Operations and Management	9/30/2009	$3.045000		$1.250000		$1.795000
18	Steady State Operations and Management	9/30/2010	$3.145000				
19	Steady State Operations and	9/30/2011	$3.245000				

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost($M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost($M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost($M)
	Management						
20	Steady State Operations and Management	9/30/2012	$3.340000				
21	Steady State Operations	9/30/2013	$3.440000				
22	Steady State Operations	9/30/2014	$3.440000				
23	Steady State Operations	9/30/2015	$3.435000				
24	Steady State Operations	9/30/2016	$3.435000				
25	Steady State Operations	9/30/2017	$3.435000				
26	Oracle Maintenance	5/29/2008	$0.050000	5/15/2008	$0.051000	14	-$0.001000
27	Oracle Maintenance	5/30/2009	$0.055000				
28	Oracle Maintenance	5/28/2010	$0.055000				
29	Oracle Maintenance	5/30/2011	$0.055000				
30	Oracle Maintenance	5/31/2012	$0.060000				
31	Oracle Maintenance	5/31/2013	$0.060000				
32	Oracle Maintenance	5/30/2014	$0.060000				
33	Oracle Maintenance	5/31/2016	$0.065000				
34	Oracle Maintenance	5/29/2015	$0.065000				
36	Oracle Maintenance	5/31/2017	$0.065000				
37	Government FTE	9/30/2001	$0.300000	9/30/2001	$0.300000	0	$0.000000
38	Government FTE	9/30/2002	$0.300000	9/30/2002	$0.300000	0	$0.000000
39	Government FTE	9/30/2003	$0.300000	9/30/2003	$0.300000	0	$0.000000
40	Government FTE	9/30/2004	$0.300000	9/30/2004	$0.300000	0	$0.000000
41	Government FTE	9/30/2005	$0.300000	9/30/2005	$0.300000	0	$0.000000
42	Government FTE	9/30/2006	$0.300000	9/30/2006	$0.300000	0	$0.000000
43	Government FTE	9/30/2007	$0.325000	9/30/2007	$0.325000	0	$0.000000
44	Government FTE	9/30/2008	$0.325000	9/30/2008	$0.325000	0	$0.000000
45	Government FTE	9/30/2009	$0.325000		$0.135000		$0.190000
46	Government FTE	9/30/2010	$0.325000				
47	Government FTE	9/30/2011	$0.350000				
48	Government FTE	9/30/2012	$0.350000				

2.b Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Planned		Actual		Variance	
		Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost($M)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost($M)	Schedule (# days)	Cost($M)
49	Government FTE	9/30/2013	$0.350000				
50	Government FTE	9/30/2014	$0.350000				
51	Government FTE	9/30/2015	$0.350000				
52	Government FTE	9/30/2016	$0.350000				
53	Government FTE	9/30/2017	$0.350000				
Project Totals		**9/30/2017**	**$57.625000**	**9/30/2008**	**$24.668000**	**3287**	**$32.957000**